arXiv:1604.04429v1 [math.GR] 15 Apr 2016

CONWAY'S GROUPOID AND ITS RELATIVES

NICK GILL, NEIL I. GILLESPIE, CHERYL E. PRAEGER, AND JASON SEMERARO

ABSTRACT. In 1997, John Conway constructed a 6-fold transitive subset M_{13} of permutations on a set of size 13 for which the subset fixing any given point was isomorphic to the Mathieu group M_{12}. The construction was via a "moving-counter puzzle" on the projective plane $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$. We discuss consequences and generalisations of Conway's construction. In particular we explore how various designs and hypergraphs can be used instead of $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$ to obtain interesting analogues of M_{13}; we refer to these analogues as *Conway groupoids*. A number of open questions are presented.

1. The first Conway groupoid M_{13}

In 1997, John Conway published a celebrated paper [11] in which he constructed the sporadic simple group of Mathieu, M_{12}, via a "moving-counter puzzle" on the projective plane $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$ of order 3. Conway noticed some new structural links between two permutation groups, namely M_{12}, which acts 5-transitively on 12 letters, and $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$, which acts 2-transitively on the 13 points of $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$. These led him to his construction of M_{13}. In [11, page 1] he writes:

> To be more precise, the point-stabilizer in $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$ is a group of structure $3^2 : 2\,\mathrm{Sym}(4)$ that permutes the 12 remaining points imprimitively in four blocks of 4, and there is an isomorphic subgroup of M_{12} that permutes the 12 letters in precisely the same fashion. Again, the line-stabilizer in $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$ is a group of this same structure, that permutes the 9 points not on that line in a doubly transitive manner, while the stabilizer of a triple in M_{12} is an isomorphic group that permutes the 9 letters not in that triple in just the same manner.
>
> In the heady days when new simple groups were being discovered right and left, this common structure suggested that there should be a new group that contained both M_{12} and $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$, various copies of which would intersect in the subgroups mentioned above.

The putative "new group" does not of course exist, but Conway's construction of M_{12} using a certain puzzle on $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$ did yield a natural definition of a *subset* of permutations that contains both of these groups in the manner just described, and Conway called it M_{13}. We discuss this puzzle briefly in Subsection 1.1, and then present some recently discovered analogues of M_{12} and M_{13} that can be obtained by variants of the puzzle, along with some of the geometry associated with these objects, especially focussing on connections to codes. Finally, we discuss attempts to classify such puzzles from a geometric and algebraic point of view.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20B15, 20B25, 05B05.

1.1. **Conway's original puzzle.** We now present Conway's original puzzle in terms of permutations, rather than the "counters" used in [11, Section 2]. This description bears little resemblance to what we traditionally think of as a "puzzle", but contains all of the salient mathematics. Our notation, too, is different from that of Conway but prepares the way for what will come later.

We write Ω for the set of 13 points of $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$. Each of the 13 lines of $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$ is incident with exactly 4 points, and each pair of points is incident with exactly one line. We think of a line as simply a 4-subset of Ω. Then, given any pair of distinct points $a, b \in \Omega$ we define the *elementary move*, denoted $[a,b]$ to be the permutation $(a,b)(c,d)$ where $\{a,b,c,d\}$ is the unique line in $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$ containing a and b. For a point $a \in \Omega$, it is convenient to define the *move* $[a,a]$ to be the identity permutation. Then, given a sequence of (not necessarily distinct) points $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_\ell$ we define the *move*

$$[a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_\ell] = [a_1, a_2] \cdot [a_2, a_3] \cdots [a_{\ell-1}, a_\ell]. \tag{1.1}$$

Note that we apply $[a_1, a_2]$ first, and then $[a_2, a_3]$, and so on, so this move maps a to b.[1] Observe that all of these moves are elements of $\mathrm{Sym}(13)$.

We now choose a point of $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$, label it ∞, and consider two subsets of $\mathrm{Sym}(13)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\infty(\mathrm{PG}(2,3)) &:= \{[a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_\ell] \mid 1 < \ell \in \mathbb{Z}, a_1, \ldots, a_\ell \in \Omega, a_1 = a_\ell = \infty\}; \\ \mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathrm{PG}(2,3)) &:= \{[a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_\ell] \mid 1 < \ell \in \mathbb{Z}, a_1, \ldots, a_\ell \in \Omega, a_1 = \infty\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

It is easy to see that the set $\pi_\infty(\mathrm{PG}(2,3))$ (which we call the *hole-stabilizer*) is, in fact, a subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega \setminus \{\infty\}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(12)$. Much less trivial is the spectacular fact due to Conway that $\pi_\infty(\mathrm{PG}(2,3))$ is isomorphic to M_{12} ([11, Sections 3 and 7]). The set $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathrm{PG}(2,3))$ is a subset of $\mathrm{Sym}(13)$ that contains M_{12}. It has size $13 \cdot |M_{12}|$ and is equal to the product $\pi_\infty(\mathrm{PG}(2,3)) \cdot \mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{PG}(2,3))$. Since $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{PG}(2,3)) \cong \mathrm{PSL}(3,3)$, the set M_{13} contains both M_{12} and $\mathrm{PSL}(3,3)$ and, moreover, contains copies of these groups intersecting in exactly the manner that Conway proposed in the quote above.

1.2. **Some variants.** A number of variants of the M_{13}-puzzle are mentioned by Conway in his original article [11]. Other variants were investigated further by Conway, Elkies and Martin [12], two of which relate to $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$ and are particularly interesting:

(1) **The signed game**. One defines moves on $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$ as before, except that the definition of an elementary move also assigns a "sign" to each letter in the permutation. We write $[a,b] = (a,b)(\underline{c},\underline{d})$ to denote that the letters c and d are given negative signs. The resulting hole-stabilizer, $\underline{\pi_\infty}(\mathrm{PG}(2,3))$, may be regarded as a subgroup of the wreath product $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \wr \mathrm{Sym}(12)$ and turns out to be isomorphic to $2M_{12}$, the double-cover of M_{12}, [12, Theorem 3.5].

(2) **The dualized game**. In this puzzle, the set Ω is the union of the point-set and the line-set of $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$. We distinguish both a point ∞, and a line $\overline{\infty}$ such that ∞ and $\overline{\infty}$ are incident in $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$. Since $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$ is self-dual, one can define moves, as in the original game, for sequences of points as

[1] The terminology intentionally suggests a "puzzle" in which, for example, the move $[\infty, a, b]$ denotes "moving" a "counter" from ∞ first to a, using the elementary move $[\infty, a]$, and then moving it from a to b, using the elementary move $[a,b]$, and so on.

well as sequences of lines. Once one has done this, one can define a move of the form

$$[p_1, q_1, p_2, q_2, \cdots, p_\ell, q_\ell] = [p_1, \ldots, p_\ell] \cdot [q_1, \ldots, q_\ell]$$

where $p_1, \ldots, p_\ell$ are points $q_1, \ldots, q_\ell$ are lines and we require that q_i is incident with p_i for all $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$, and q_i is incident with p_{i+1} for all $i = 1, \ldots, \ell - 1$. One can define analogously a hole-stabilizer $\pi^d_\infty(\mathrm{PG}(2,3))$, except that here we require $p_1 = p_\ell = \infty$ and $q_1 = q_\ell = \overline{\infty}$. The group $\pi^d_\infty(\mathrm{PG}(2,3))$ is isomorphic to M_{12} and its action on Ω splits into two orbits: the point-set and line-set. By interchanging the point-set and line-set appropriately one can obtain a concrete representation of the outer automorphism of M_{12}, [12, Section 4].

1.3. **Multiple transitivity.** The groups $M_{12}, \mathrm{Sym}(5), \mathrm{Sym}(6)$ and $\mathrm{Alt}(7)$ are the only finite permutation groups which are sharply 5-transitive, that is, they are transitive on ordered 5-tuples of distinct points and only the identity fixes such a 5-tuple. Moreover, if G is a sharply k-transitive group with $k \geqslant 6$, then $G = \mathrm{Sym}(k), \mathrm{Sym}(k+1)$ or $Alt(k+2)$, (see [14, Theorem 7.6A]). The set M_{13}, however, having size $13 \cdot |M_{12}|$, seemed a good candidate to be a "sharply 6-transitive subset of permutations", and to clarify the meaning of this phrase, Conway, Elkies and Martin introduced the following notions in [12, Section 5.1]. Here $\mathcal{P}$ denotes the set of all ordered 6-tuples of distinct points of $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$.

- A tuple $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$ is a *universal donor* if, for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, there exists $g \in M_{13}$ such that $\mathbf{p}^g = \mathbf{q}$.
- A tuple $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}$ is a *universal recipient* if, for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$, there exists $g \in M_{13}$ such that $\mathbf{p}^g = \mathbf{q}$.

They proved the following result [12, Theorems 5.2 and 5.3] which gives full information regarding the sense in which M_{13} is a sharply 6-transitive subset.

Theorem 1.1. (1) *A tuple $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \ldots, p_6) \in \mathcal{P}$ is a universal donor if and only if $p_i = \infty$ for some i.*
(2) *A tuple $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}$ is a universal recipient if and only if $\mathbf{q}$ contains a line of* $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$.

An alternative approach to the study of multiply-transitive sets of permutations was proposed and studied by Martin and Sagan [25]; earlier studies in the wider context of "sharp subsets" of permutations are discussed in [10]. The problem of computing the transitivity of M_{13} in the sense of Martin and Sagan was completed by Nakashima [26]. Sharp k-transitivity of subsets of permutations was also studied by Bonisoli and Quattrocchi [4]. Their result is very strong although it applies only to so-called "invertible" sets (and M_{13} is not invertible).

2. A more general setting for groupoids

For the rest of this paper we turn our attention to work inspired by Conway's construction of M_{13}, and which seeks to generalize it in various ways. This more general setting was first considered in [16]; it involves the notion of a 4-*hypergraph*, namely a pair $\mathcal{D} := (\Omega, \mathcal{B})$, where Ω is a finite set of size n, and $\mathcal{B}$ is a finite multiset of subsets of Ω (called lines), each of size 4. Observe that $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$ is a 4-hypergraph on a set of size 13. A pair a, b of (not necessarily distinct) points is called *collinear* if a, b are contained in some line of $\mathcal{D}$, and $\mathcal{D}$ is said to be *connected* if, for all

$a, b \in \Omega$, there exists a finite sequence $a_0 = a, a_1, \ldots, a_k = b$ of points from Ω such that each pair a_{i-1}, a_i is collinear.

Consider an arbitrary connected 4-hypergraph $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{B})$. For a pair of distinct collinear points $a, b \in \Omega$ we define the *elementary move*, denoted $[a, b]$, to be the permutation

$$(a, b)(c_1, d_1)(c_2, d_2) \cdots (c_\lambda, d_\lambda)$$

where $\{a, b, c_i, d_i\}$ (for $i = 1, \ldots, \lambda$) are the lines of $\mathcal{D}$ containing a and b. The value of λ in general depends on a and b. To ensure that each elementary move is well defined, the 4-hypergraph $\mathcal{D}$ is required to be *pliable*, that is, whenever two lines have at least three points in common, the two lines contain exactly the same points.

The rest of the set-up proceeds *á la* the analysis of M_{13} given at the start of §1.1: We define the move $[a, a]$ to be the identity permutation, for each a, and for a sequence $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_\ell$ such that each pair a_{i-1}, a_i is collinear, we define the move $[a_1, \ldots, a_n]$ exactly as in (1.1). Finally, we distinguish a point of $\mathcal{D}$ which we call ∞, and we define the hole-stabilizer $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ and the set $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ as in (1.2). The set $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is again a subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega \setminus \{\infty\})$, and the subset $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ is an analogue of Conway's M_{13}.

In [11], Conway recognised that M_{13} could be endowed with the structure of a *groupoid* (that is, a small category in which all morphisms are isomorphisms). The set M_{13} is sometimes referred to as the *Mathieu groupoid*. We define an analogue of this notion in this more general setting, and explain the connection between the set and the category.

For a pliable, connected 4-hypergraph $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{B})$, the *Conway groupoid* $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{D})$ is the small category whose object set is Ω, such that, for $a, b \in \Omega$, the set $\mathrm{Mor}(a, b)$ of morphisms from a to b is precisely

$$\mathrm{Mor}(a, b) := \{[a, a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1}, b] \mid a_{i-1}, a_i \in \Omega \text{ for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}$ is connected, there exists a finite sequence $\infty = b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_\ell = a$ such that each pair b_{i-1}, b_i is collinear. Hence $\rho := [\infty, b_1, \ldots, b_{\ell-1}, a] \in \mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$. Moreover, for each $b \in \Omega$ and each $\sigma = [a, a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1}, b] \in \mathrm{Mor}(a, b)$, we also have $\tau := [\infty, b_1, \ldots, b_{\ell-1}, a, a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1}, b] \in \mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$, and $\sigma = \rho^{-1} \cdot \tau$. In particular, the category $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{D})$ is completely determined by the set $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$. Thus, just as the term *Mathieu groupoid* is applied in the literature to both $\mathcal{C}(\mathrm{PG}(2, 3))$ and $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathrm{PG}(2, 3))$, so also the term *Conway groupoid* is used for both $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{D})$ and $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ (although we tend to focus on the latter). The following result, which follows from [16, Lemma 3.1], is relevant.

Lemma 2.1. [16] *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a pliable 4-hypergraph for which each pair of points is collinear. Let ∞_1, ∞_2 be points of $\mathcal{D}$. Then $\pi_{\infty_1}(\mathcal{D}) \cong \pi_{\infty_2}(\mathcal{D})$ (as permutation groups).*

This lemma can be strengthened so that we obtain the same conclusion, supposing only that $\mathcal{D}$ is a pliable, connected 4-hypergraph. The lemma allows us to talk about "the" hole stabilizer of such a hypergraph without having to specify the base point ∞. A similar statement also holds for the sets $\mathcal{L}_{\infty_1}(\mathcal{D})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\infty_2}(\mathcal{D})$, allowing us to talk about "the" hole stabilizer of a pliable, connected 4-hypergraph.

2.1. **Some examples.** For this section, we need some definitions: for positive integers, n, k, λ, a $2-(n, k, \lambda)$-*design* $(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ consists of a set Ω of "points" of size n,

and a multiset $\mathcal{B}$ of k-element subsets of Ω (called "lines") such that any 2-subset of Ω lies in exactly λ lines. The design $(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ is called *simple* if there are no repeated lines (that is, $\mathcal{B}$ is a set, rather than a multiset). If $k = 4$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ is a simple $2-(n, 4, \lambda)$-design, then $(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ is a connected 4-hypergraph. Further, if in addition $(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ is pliable, that is, if distinct lines intersect in a set of size at most 2, then $(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ is called *supersimple*.

The search for examples of interesting new Conway groupoids, which we report on, has focussed almost exclusively on the situation where the 4-hypergraph $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ is a supersimple $2-(n, 4, \lambda)$ design. In particular, Lemma 2.1 applies and the isomorphism class of the hole-stabilizer is, up to permutation isomorphism, independent of the choice of the point ∞.

Let us first consider a somewhat degenerate case: it turns out that $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) = \mathrm{Alt}(\Omega \setminus \{\infty\})$ if and only if $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D}) = \mathrm{Alt}(\Omega)$, and $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) = \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega \setminus \{\infty\})$ if and only if $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D}) = \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$. In these cases the puzzle-construction sheds no new light on the groups in question, and can be safely ignored. It turns out that for very many of the supersimple $2-(n, k, \lambda)$ designs $\mathcal{D}$ examined, the corresponding Conway groupoid is of this type. Indeed it turns out that if n is sufficiently large relative to λ, then $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ always contains $\mathrm{Alt}(\Omega)$.

Lemma 2.2. [19, Theorem E(3)] *If $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ is a supersimple $2-(n, 4, \lambda)$ design with $n > 144\lambda^2 + 120\lambda + 26$, then $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D}) \supseteq \mathrm{Alt}(\Omega)$.*

We shall have more to say about the relationship between n and λ in Theorem 4.1. However this crude bound is sufficient to show, for example, that the Conway groupoids for the point-line designs of projective spaces $\mathrm{PG}(r, 3)$ and affine spaces $\mathrm{AG}(r, 4)$ contain $\mathrm{Alt}(\Omega)$ whenever $r \geqslant 5$. The first infinite family of examples without this property was studied in [16].

Example 2.3. The *Boolean quadruple system of order* 2^m, where $m \geqslant 2$, is the design $\mathcal{D}^b = (\Omega^b, \mathcal{B}^b)$ such that Ω^b is identified with the set of vectors in $\mathbb{F}_2^m$, and

$$\mathcal{B}^b := \{\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\} \mid v_i \in \Omega^b \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{4} v_i = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

Equivalently, we can define

$$\mathcal{B}^b = \{v + W \mid v \in \Omega^b, W \leqslant \mathbb{F}_2^m, \dim(W) = 2\};$$

that is, $\mathcal{B}^b$ is the set of all affine planes of Ω^b. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{D}$ is both a 3-$(2^m, 4, 1)$ Steiner quadruple system and a supersimple 2-$(2^m, 4, 2^{m-1} - 1)$ design. It turns out that $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}^b)$ is trivial. In addition, the Conway groupoid $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D}^b)$ is equal to the group of translations E_{2^m} acting transitively on Ω^b [16, Theorem B, Section 5].

The approach in the literature to finding new examples from supersimple designs has tended to be organised in terms of the behaviour of the hole stabilizer (as a subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega \setminus \{\infty\})$). For a Boolean quadruple system $\mathcal{D}^b$, the trivial group $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}^b)$ is clearly intransitive on the set $\Omega \setminus \{\infty\}$. However, examples with intransitive hole-stabilizers seem quite rare. We only know three other examples. They are given in [16, Table 1], and have parameters:

(1) $(n, \lambda) = (16, 6)$ and $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(3) \times \mathrm{Sym}(3) \times \mathrm{Sym}(3) \times \mathrm{Sym}(3) \times \mathrm{Sym}(3)$;
(2) $(n, \lambda) = (17, 6)$ and $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(8) \times \mathrm{Sym}(8)$;
(3) $(n, \lambda) = (49, 18)$ and $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(24) \times \mathrm{Sym}(24)$.

Question 2.4. *Apart from Boolean quadruple systems, are there infinitely many supersimple designs for which the hole-stabilizers are intransitive?*

We next turn our attention to the situation where the hole-stabilizers are transitive on $\Omega \setminus \{\infty\}$. Examples for which this action is imprimitive also seem to be rare. Only one example appears in [16, Table 1]: it has parameters $(n, \lambda) = (9, 3)$ and $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) \cong \mathrm{Alt}(4) \wr C_2$.

Question 2.5. *Are there more examples of supersimple designs $\mathcal{D}$ for which $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is transitive and imprimitive?*

In [19] two infinite families of designs are studied for which the hole-stabilizers are primitive. To describe them we need the following set-up: Let $m \geqslant 2$ and $V := (\mathbb{F}_2)^{2m}$ be a vector space equipped with the standard basis. Define

$$e := \begin{pmatrix} 0_m & I_m \\ 0_m & 0_m \end{pmatrix}, \qquad f := \begin{pmatrix} 0_m & I_m \\ I_m & 0_m \end{pmatrix} = e + e^T, \tag{2.1}$$

where I_m and 0_m represent the $m \times m$ identity and zero matrices respectively. We write elements of V as row vectors and define $\varphi(u, v)$ as the alternating bilinear form $\varphi(u, v) := ufv^T$. We also set $\theta(u) := ueu^T \in \mathbb{F}_2$, so that

$$\theta(u + v) + \theta(u) + \theta(v) = \varphi(u, v).$$

(Note that the right hand side equals $uev^T + veu^T$ while the left hand side is $u(e + e^T)v^T$.) Finally, for each $v \in V$ define $\theta_v(u) := \theta(u) + \varphi(u, v)$, and note that $\theta_0 = \theta$.

Example 2.6. The *Symplectic quadruple system of order* 2^{2m}, where $m \geqslant 2$, is the design $\mathcal{D}^a = (\Omega^a, \mathcal{B}^a)$, where $\Omega^a := V$ and

$$\mathcal{B}^a := \left\{ \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\} \mid v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 \in \Omega^a, \sum_{i=1}^4 v_i = \mathbf{0}, \sum_{i=1}^4 \theta(v_i) = 0 \right\}.$$

By [19, Theorem B] for $m \geqslant 3$ and [16, Table 1] for $m = 2$, $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D}^a) \cong 2^{2m}.\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$, while $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}^a) \cong \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$. Indeed, taking ∞ to be the zero vector in V, $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}^a) = \mathrm{Isom}(\mathrm{V}, \varphi)$, the isometry group of the formed space (V, φ).

Example 2.7. The *Quadratic quadruple systems of order* 2^{2m}, where $m \geqslant 3$, are the designs $\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon = (\Omega^\varepsilon, \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon)$, for $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$, such that $\Omega^\varepsilon := \{\theta_v \mid v \in V, \theta(v) = \varepsilon\}$ and

$$\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon := \left\{ \{\theta_{v_1}, \theta_{v_2}, \theta_{v_3}, \theta_{v_4}\} \mid \theta_{v_1}, \theta_{v_2}, \theta_{v_3}, \theta_{v_4} \in \Omega^\varepsilon, \sum_{i=1}^4 v_i = \mathbf{0} \right\}.$$

By [19, Theorem B], $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon) \cong \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$, the isometry group of φ, while $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon) \cong \mathrm{O}^{\varepsilon'}_{2\mathrm{m}}(2)$, where $\varepsilon' = \pm$ and $\varepsilon = (1 - \varepsilon' 1)/2$ (as an integer in $\{0, 1\}$).

We remark that the set of lines in $\mathcal{D}^a$ coincides with the set of translates of the totally isotropic 2-subspaces of Ω^a. This alternative interpretation provides a link with Example 2.3. The designs in Example 2.7 can be rephrased similarly (see [18, §6]). Note, too, that Example 2.7 can be extended to include the case $m = 2$, but only for $\varepsilon = 0$. In this case, [16, Table 1] asserts that $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D}^0) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(6)$ and $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}^0) \cong O_4^+(2) = \mathrm{Sym}(3) \wr \mathrm{Sym}(2)$.

The examples described thus far represent all those known for which $\mathcal{D}$ is a supersimple design. Note that in Examples 2.3, 2.6 and 2.7, the Conway groupoid $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is always a group – we shall have more to say on this phenomenon in §4.2.2.

3. Conway groupoids and codes

In this section we consider certain codes that arise naturally from the supersimple designs initially used to define Conway groupoids. We use the following terminology from coding theory. A *code* of length m over an alphabet Q of size q is a subset of vertices of the Hamming graph $H(m,q)$, which is the graph Γ with vertex set $V(\Gamma)$ consisting of all m-tuples with entries from Q, and such that two vertices are adjacent if they differ in precisely one entry. Consequently, the (Hamming) distance $d(\alpha,\beta)$ between two vertices $\alpha,\beta \in V(\Gamma)$ is equal to the number of entries in which they differ. If Q is a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$, then we identify $V(\Gamma)$ with the space $\mathbb{F}_q^m$ of m-dimensional row vectors. In this case a code is called *linear* if it is a subspace of $\mathbb{F}_q^m$. We only consider linear codes in this section.

The *support* of a vertex $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_m) \in V(\Gamma)$ is the set $\mathrm{supp}(\alpha) = \{i \mid \alpha_i \neq 0\}$, and the *weight* of α is $\mathrm{wt}(\alpha) = |\mathrm{supp}(\alpha)|$. Given a code C in $H(m,q)$, the *minimum distance* of C is the minimum of $d(\alpha,\beta)$ for distinct codewords $\alpha,\beta \in C$, and for a vertex $\beta \in V(\Gamma)$, the distance from β to C is defined as

$$d(\beta, C) = \min\{d(\beta,\alpha) \mid \alpha \in C\}.$$

The *covering radius ρ of C* is the maximum of these distances:

$$\rho = \max\{d(\beta, C) \mid \beta \in V(\Gamma)\}.$$

For $i = 0\ldots,\rho$ we let

$$C_i = \{\beta \mid d(\beta, C) = i\},$$

so $C_0 = C$, and we call the partition $\{C, C_1, \ldots, C_\rho\}$ of $V(\Gamma)$ the *distance partition of C*.

A code is *completely regular* if its distance partition is *equitable*, that is, if the number of vertices in C_j adjacent to a vertex in C_i depends only on i,j and not on the choice of the vertex (for all i,j). Such codes have a high degree of combinatorial symmetry, and have been studied extensively (see, for example, [9, 13, 27] and more recently [5, 6, 8, 28, 29, 30]). Additionally, certain distance regular graphs can be described as coset graphs of completely regular codes [9, p.353], and so such codes are also of interest to graph theorists. *Completely transitive codes*, which are a subfamily of completely regular codes with a high degree of algebraic symmetry, have also been studied (see [7, 20, 33] for example).

For linear codes, the *degree* s of a code is the number of values that occur as weights of non-zero codewords. The *dual degree* s^* of a linear code C is the degree of its dual code $C^\perp$, where $C^\perp$ consists of all $\beta \in V(\Gamma)$ such that the dot product $\alpha \cdot \beta := \sum_i \alpha_i\beta_i$ is equal to zero, for all codewords $\alpha \in C$. The covering radius ρ of a code C is at most s^*, and $\rho = s^*$ if and only if C is *uniformly packed (in the wide sense)* [3]. Completely regular codes are necessarily uniformly packed [9], but only a few constructions of uniformly packed codes that are not completely regular are known [29].

3.1. **The ternary Golay code.** For a hypergraph or design $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{B})$, its *incidence matrix* is the matrix whose columns are indexed by the points of Ω, whose rows are indexed by the lines of $\mathcal{B}$, and such that the (a,ℓ)-entry is 1 if the point a lies in the line ℓ, and is zero otherwise. The row vectors are therefore binary n-tuples, where $n = |\Omega|$, and we may interpret their entries as elements of any field. For a field F of order q, the code $C_F(\mathcal{D})$ is defined as the linear span over F of the rows of the incidence matrix of $\mathcal{D}$. It is contained in the Hamming graph $H(n,q)$.

In [12], the authors considered the code $C_{\mathbb{F}_3}(\mathrm{PG}(2,3))$. They also constructed certain subcodes of this code, proving that one was the *ternary Golay code*. Note that the ternary Golay code which Conway et al. refer to is usually called the extended ternary Golay code in the coding theory literature. It is a $[12,6,6]_3$ code, which when punctured gives the perfect $[11,6,5]_3$ Golay code. We now describe their construction.

Let $\mathcal{C} = C_{\mathbb{F}_3}(\mathrm{PG}(2,3))$, and let $p \in \mathcal{P}$, the point set of $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$. Conway et al. define

$$\mathcal{C}_p = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{C} \mid \alpha_p = -\sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \alpha_i\},$$

and prove that the restriction of $\mathcal{C}_p$ to the coordinates $\mathcal{P}\backslash\{p\}$ is isomorphic to the $[12,6,6]_3$ ternary Golary code [12, Prop. 3.2], which has automorphism group M_{12}. It is this fact that is used by Conway et al. to prove that $\pi_\infty(\mathrm{PG}(2,3)) \cong M_{12}$, [12, Thm. 3.5].

We now show that the full code $\mathcal{C}$ also has interesting properties which, to our knowledge, have not been observed previously.

Theorem 3.1. *$\mathcal{C}$ is uniformly packed (in the wide sense), but not completely regular.*

In order to prove this, we consider the following subcode of $\mathcal{C}$, which Conway et al. use to determine certain properties of $\mathcal{C}$:

$$\mathcal{C}' = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{C} \mid \sum \alpha_i = 0\}.$$

For a line ℓ of $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$, let h_ℓ denote the weight 4 vector in $H(13,3)$ with i-entry equal to 1 if $i \in \ell$, and zero otherwise.

Lemma 3.2. [12, Prop. 3.1] *Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$. Then*

i) $\mathrm{wt}(\alpha) \equiv 0$ *or* $1 \pmod 3$*;*
ii) $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}'$ *if and only if* $\mathrm{wt}(\alpha) \equiv 0 \pmod 3$*;*
iii) $\mathcal{C}^\perp = \mathcal{C}'$*;*
iv) $\mathcal{C}$ *and* $\mathcal{C}'$ *have minimum distance* 4, 6*, respectively, and the weight* 4 *codewords in* $\mathcal{C}$ *are precisely the vectors* $\pm h_\ell$*, for lines* ℓ *of* $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$*;*
v) *Let* ℓ *be a line in* $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$*. Then*

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \alpha_i = \sum_{i \in \ell} \alpha_i. \tag{3.1}$$

We also need the following concepts. A vertex β is said to *cover* a vertex α if $\beta_i = \alpha_i$ for all $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\alpha)$. So for example, $(2,1,1,0)$ covers $(2,1,0,0)$ in $\mathbb{F}_3^4$. A set $\mathcal{S}$ of vertices of weight k in $\mathbb{F}_q^m$ is a $q-ary\ t-(m,k,\lambda)$ *design* if every vertex of weight t in $\mathbb{F}_q^m$ is covered by exactly λ elements of $\mathcal{S}$. It is known that for a linear completely regular code C in $\mathbb{F}_q^m$ with minimum distance δ, the set of codewords of weight k forms a q-ary $\lfloor \frac{\delta}{2} \rfloor - (m,k,\lambda)$ design for some λ [34, Theorem 2.4.7].

Proof of Theorem 3.1. First we show that $\mathcal{C}$ is uniformly packed. By Lemma 3.2, and since the codes have length 13, the possible weights of non-zero codewords of $\mathcal{C}^\perp = \mathcal{C}'$ are 6, 9 and 12, and hence $s^* \leqslant 3$. Also, since $\mathcal{C}$ has minimum distance 4, the covering radius ρ is at least 2, so $2 \leqslant \rho \leqslant s^* \leqslant 3$. Let ℓ_i for $i = 1, 2$ denote two of the four lines that contain the point 1 in $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$, and let x, y be points on ℓ_1, ℓ_2 respectively, that are distinct from 1. Let ν be any vertex of weight

3 with $\mathrm{supp}(\nu) = \{1, x, y\}$. Since $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$ is a projective plane, it follows that $|\mathrm{supp}(\nu) \cap \ell| \leqslant 2$ for all lines ℓ of $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$. Thus, Lemma 3.2(iv) implies that $d(\nu, \alpha) \geqslant 3$ for all codewords α of weight 4. Since all other codewords in $\mathcal{C}$ have weight at least 6, it followse that $d(\nu, \mathcal{C}) \geqslant 3$, and hence $\rho = s^* = 3$. Thus $\mathcal{C}$ is uniformly packed.

Suppose that $\mathcal{C}$ is completely regular. Then the set of codewords of weight 4 forms a 3-ary $2-(13,4,\lambda)$ design for some $\lambda > 0$. However, by Lemma 3.2(iv), every vertex of weight 2 with constant non-zero entries is covered by exactly one codeword of weight 4, whereas a vertex of weight 2 with distinct non-zero entries is not covered by any codeword of weight 4. This contradiction proves that $\mathcal{C}$ is not completely regular. □

3.2. **Conway groupoids and completely regular codes.** As we have seen, the Conway groupoid M_{13} is interesting in several different ways. Its hole stabilizer $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is multiply transitive, and hence primitive; the perfect Golay code over $\mathbb{F}_3$ can be constructed from $C_{\mathbb{F}_3}(\mathrm{PG}(2,3))$; and, moreover, the code $C_{\mathbb{F}_3}(\mathrm{PG}(2,3))$ has some interesting and rare properties. Thus it is natural to ask if one can construct other interesting codes from supersimple designs $\mathcal{D}$ for which $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is acting primitively. This question was addressed in [19] for the designs defined in Examples 2.6 and 2.7.

Theorem 3.3. *The following hold:*

(a) *For $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$, $C_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon)$ is a completely transitive code with covering radius 3 and minimum distance 4.*
(b) *$C_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{D}^a)$ is a completely transitive code with covering radius 4 and minimum distance 4.*

The following question arises naturally as a consequence of Theorems 3.1 and 3.3.

Question 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ be a supersimple $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ design such that $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is a primitive subgroup $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega \setminus \{\infty\})$ which does not contain $\mathrm{Alt}(\Omega \setminus \{\infty\})$. Does there exist a prime r such that $C_{\mathbb{F}_r}(\mathcal{D})$ is completely regular, or at the very least uniformly packed (in the wide sense)?*

We remarked earlier that for each point $p \in \mathrm{PG}(2,3)$, Conway et al define a code $\mathcal{C}_p$ with the property that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C}_p) \cong M_{12}$. They use this code to show that $\pi_\infty(\mathrm{PG}(2,3)) \cong M_{12}$: namely, in [12, Proposition 3.3] they show that the elementary move $[p,q]$ sends $\mathcal{C}_p$ to $\mathcal{C}_q$, and from this they deduce in [12, Proposition 3.4] that $\pi_\infty(\mathrm{PG}(2,3)) \leqslant M_{12}$. Equality then follows by an explicit computation. Arguing in this spirit, with $\mathcal{C}$ being one of the codes $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{D})$ of Theorem 3.3, it is relatively straightforward to show that for and point p of $\mathcal{D}$, the code $\mathcal{C}_p$ obtained by puncturing $\mathcal{C}$ at p has automorphism group isomorphic to the stabilizer $\mathrm{Stab}_{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})}(p)$ of p. Moreover, the elementary move $[p,q]$ sends $\mathcal{C}_p$ to $\mathcal{C}_q$, and we deduce that $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) \leqslant \mathrm{Stab}_{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})}(p)$. This fact can be used to give an alternative proof (to that given in [19]) of the isomorphism type of $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ for the designs $\mathcal{D}$ defined in Examples 2.6 and 2.7.

4. Classification results

The programme to classify Conway groupoids has, thus far, been restricted to the situation where $\mathcal{D}$ is a supersimple $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ design, a family which includes $\mathrm{PG}(2,3)$. In this section we describe the progress that has been made in this setting.

4.1. **Relation between n and λ.** In this subsection we connect the relative values of the parameters λ and n with the behaviour of the hole stabilizer $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ in its action on $\Omega\backslash\{\infty\}$. By examining the examples given in §2.1 one may be lead to observe the following: if we fix λ and allow n to increase, the way $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ acts on $\Omega\setminus\{\infty\}$ seems to move through the following states:

$$\text{trivial} \longrightarrow \text{intransitive} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c}\text{transitive}\\ \text{imprimitive}\end{array} \longrightarrow \text{primitive} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{l}\mathrm{Alt}(\Omega\setminus\{\infty\}) \text{ or}\\ \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega\setminus\{\infty\}).\end{array}$$

This observation was proved and quantified in [16, 19]. We note first that two points in a $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ design lie together on λ lines, and the set theoretic union of these lines in a supersimple design has size $2\lambda+2$. Thus for supersimple designs we must have $n \geqslant 2\lambda+2$. On the other hand, Lemma 2.2 gives an upper bound in terms of λ beyond which, for all designs $\mathcal{D}$, $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is $\mathrm{Alt}(\Omega\setminus\{\infty\})$ or $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega\setminus\{\infty\})$. This bound is refined in the result quoted below, and we make some comments about the proof in Remark 4.2.

Theorem 4.1. *(*[16, Theorem B] *and* [19, Theorem E]*) Suppose that $\mathcal{D}$ is a supersimple $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ design, and ∞ is a point of $\mathcal{D}$.*

1. *If $n > 2\lambda+2$, then $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is non-trivial;*
2. *if $n > 4\lambda+1$, then $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is transitive;*
3. *if $n > 9\lambda+1$, then $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is primitive;*
4. *if $n > 9\lambda^2-12\lambda+5$, then either $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) \subseteq \mathrm{Alt}(\Omega\setminus\{\infty\})$, or else $\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{PG}(2,3)$, $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) = M_{12}$ (and $\lambda = 1$).*

Remark 4.2. (a) The proofs of the first three parts of Theorem 4.1 are independent of the Classification of the Finite Simple Groups (CFSG) (as is that of Lemma 2.2), but this is not true for part (4).

(b) Part (1) can be strengthened: in [16, Theorem B] it was shown that $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is trivial if and only if $\mathcal{D}$ is a Boolean quadruple system, that is, one of the designs from Example 2.3.

(c) While the proofs of parts (2) and (3) are relatively straightforward counting arguments, the proof of Lemma 2.2 lies somewhat deeper. It relies on a lower bound proved by Babai [2] for the minimum number of points moved by a non-identity element of a primitive permutation group that does not contain the full alternating group. Babai's bound is combined with the observation that a move sequence $[\infty,a,b,\infty]$ will have support of size at most $6\lambda+2$; now one must check that there exists such an element that is non-trivial, and the result follows.

(d) Part (4) (which is an improvement on Lemma 2.2) is obtained via the same method except that only those move sequences $[\infty,a,b,\infty]$ for which a,b and ∞ are collinear are considered, and the result of Babai is replaced by a stronger result due to Liebeck and Saxl [22]; it is here that the dependence on CFSG enters.

(e) It is natural to ask whether the bounds in Lemma 2.2 and Theorem 4.1 are best possible. Certainly part (1) cannot be improved, but for the others it is less clear.

Question 4.3. *Can the quadratic function in Lemma 2.2 be replaced by a linear function?*

An immediate corollary of Theorem 4.1 is the following.

Corollary 4.4. *For a positive integer λ, there are only finitely many supersimple $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ designs $(\Omega,\mathcal{B})$ for which $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D})$ does not contain* $\mathrm{Alt}(\Omega)$.

This corollary suggests that a full classification for a given λ may be possible. This has been achieved for $\lambda \leqslant 2$ in [16, Theorem C], but all other cases are open.

Theorem 4.5. [16, Theorem C] *Let $\mathcal{D}=(\Omega,\mathcal{B})$ be a supersimple 2-$(n,4,\lambda)$ design for which $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D})$ does not contain* $\mathrm{Alt}(\Omega)$*, and such that $\lambda \leqslant 2$. Let $\infty \in \Omega$. Then either*

(1) *$\lambda = 1$, $\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{PG}(2,3)$ and $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) = M_{12}$; or*
(2) *$\lambda = 2$, $\mathcal{D}$ is the unique supersimple $2-(10,4,2)$ design and $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) = \mathrm{Sym}(3) \wr \mathrm{Sym}(2)$.*

The design in Theorem 4.5 (2) is connected to the family of designs in Example 2.7 (recall that $\mathrm{Sym}(3)\wr\mathrm{Sym}(2) \cong \mathrm{O}_4^+(2)$ and see the remark after Example 2.7). Theorem 4.5 pre-dates Theorem 4.1, but its proof is of a similar flavour. In this case, the result of Babai mentioned in Remark 4.2 is replaced by classical work of Manning classifying primitive permutation groups that contain non-identity elements moving less than 9 points, [23, 24].

Question 4.6. *Can those $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ designs $\mathcal{D}$ be classified for which $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D})$ does not contain* $\mathrm{Alt}(\Omega)$ *and λ is, say, $3, 4$ or 5?*

Some remarks concerning a classification for $\lambda = 3$ can be found in [19, §7.3].

4.2. **Extra structure.** In this section we consider two instances where we have been able to give a complete classification of Conway groupoids $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ subject to some set of conditions on the elementary moves, for supersimple designs $\mathcal{D}$.

4.2.1. *Collinear triples yielding trivial move sequences.* Here we consider [19, Theorem D] which was a critical ingredient in the proof of Theorem 4.1 (4) above, and which generalizes the classification of Conway groupoids associated with $2-(n,4,1)$ designs given in Theorem 4.5.

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose that $\mathcal{D}$ is a supersimple $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ design, and that $[\infty,a,b,\infty] = 1$ whenever ∞ is collinear with $\{a,b\}$. Then one of the following is true:*

(1) *$\mathcal{D}$ is a Boolean quadruple system and $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is trivial;*
(2) *$\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{PG}(2,3)$ (the projective plane of order 3) and $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) \cong M_{12}$; or*
(3) *$\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) \supseteq \mathrm{Alt}(\Omega \setminus \{\infty\})$.*

Recall that a Boolean quadruple system was defined in Example 2.3. The proof of Theorem 4.7 given in [19] involves an interesting intermediate result, [19, Proposition 6.4]. This result asserts that any design $\mathcal{D}$ which satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 4.7 can be constructed in a rather curious way: one starts with a $2-(n,2^{\alpha+1},1)$ design $\mathcal{D}_0$ (for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+$) and one "replaces" each line in $\mathcal{D}_0$ with a Boolean quadruple system of order $2^{\alpha+1}$. One thereby obtains a $2-(n,4,2^\alpha-1)$ design satisfying the given hypothesis, and all such designs arise in this way.

4.2.2. *Regular two-graphs.* In this section we study three properties which turn out to be connected in the context of Conway groupoids.

Firstly, a $2-(n,3,\mu)$ design $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$ is a *regular two-graph* if, for any 4-subset X of Ω, either $0, 2$ or 4 of the 3-subsets of X lie in $\mathcal{C}$. We are interested in those $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ designs $\mathcal{D}$ for which the pair $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$ is a regular two-graph, where $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of triples of collinear points.

Secondly, we consider designs $\mathcal{D}=(\Omega,\mathcal{B})$ that satisfy the following property:

$$(\triangle) \qquad \text{if } B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B} \text{ such that } |B_1 \cap B_2| = 2, \text{ then } B_1 \triangle B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$$

where $B_1 \triangle B_2$ denotes the *symmetric difference* of B_1 and B_2.

Finally, we are interested in those designs for which $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is a group. The following result which is (part of) [18, Theorems A and 4.2] connects these three properties. It is proved combinatorially.

Theorem 4.8. *Let $\mathcal{D}=(\Omega,\mathcal{B})$ be a supersimple $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ design with $n>2\lambda+2$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the set of collinear triples of points in Ω, and let $\infty\in\Omega$. Then the following hold.*

(a) *If $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is a group then $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is primitive on Ω.*
(b) *If $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$ is a regular two-graph then $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is transitive on $\Omega\setminus\{\infty\}$.*
(c) *If $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$ is a regular two-graph and $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is a group then $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is primitive on $\Omega\setminus\{\infty\}$.*
(d) *If $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$ is a regular two-graph and $\mathcal{D}$ satisfies $(\triangle)$, then $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is a group.*

It turns out that part (d) can be strengthened: in [18, Theorem 4.2]) we show that the group $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is in fact a subgroup of automorphisms of $\mathcal{D}$, and is a 3-transposition group with respect to its set $\mathcal{E}$ of elementary moves. This observation was combined in [18] with Fischer's classification of finite 3-transposition groups ([15]) to classify Conway groupoids arising from designs $\mathcal{D}$ that satisfy the hypotheses of part (d).

The conditions of part (d) were also used in [18] in another way: it turns out that, for any point $\infty\in\Omega$, the assumptions of part (d), together with the condition $n>2\lambda+2$, imply that $(\Omega\setminus\{\infty\},\mathcal{C}_\infty)$ is a polar space in the sense of Buekenhout and Shult, where $\mathcal{C}_\infty$ is the set of all triples of points in $\Omega\setminus\{\infty\}$ which occur in a line with ∞. In fact, the polar space $(\Omega\setminus\{\infty\},\mathcal{C}_\infty)$ has the extra property that all lines in the space contain exactly three points. Such polar spaces were characterized in a special case by Shult [32] and then later, in full generality, by Seidel [31]. Seidel's result was used to derive the following classification result. This result provides an alternative proof for the classification of the associated Conway groupoids, avoiding the use of 3-transposition groups.

Theorem 4.9. [18, Theorem C] *Let $\mathcal{D}=(\Omega,\mathcal{B})$ be a supersimple $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ design that satisfies $(\triangle)$ and for which $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$ is a regular two-graph where $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of collinear triples of points in Ω. Then one of the following holds:*

(a) *$\mathcal{D}$ is a Boolean quadruple system, as in Example 2.3;*
(b) *$\mathcal{D}$ is a Symplectic quadruple system, as in Example 2.6;*
(c) *$\mathcal{D}$ is a Quadratic quadruple system, as in Example 2.7.*

Note that the structures of the corresponding hole stabilizers and Conway groupoids are listed in the relevant examples. One naturally wonders if this theorem can be strengthened:

Question 4.10. *Can Theorem 4.9 be extended to cover the situation where ($\triangle$) does not hold? Are there any additional examples?*

We conclude by noting that the statements of Theorems 4.1 and 4.7 both require particular clauses to deal with M_{13}: it seems that, in the world of Conway groupoids, M_{13} is rather special. The following question connects this notion to the study of Conway groupoids with extra structure.

Question 4.11. *Is M_{13} the only Conway groupoid which is not itself a subgroup of* $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$*, and for which the associated hole stabilizer $\pi_\infty(\Omega)$ is a primitive subgroup of* $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega \setminus \{\infty\})$*?*

Note that the Conway groupoids arising in Examples 2.6 and 2.7 have primitive hole stabilizers, but *are* subgroups of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$.

5. Generation games

We have seen that a supersimple $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ design provides a convenient structure by which to associate with each pair $\{a,b\}$ of points a permutation $[a,b]$ sending a to b. We conclude this survey by considering a few other combinatorial structures which might be exploited to find interesting new Conway groupoids.

5.1. **Working with triples.** For a $2-(n,3,\mu)$ design $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$, a map $[\cdot,\cdot]:\Omega\times\Omega\longrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ is said to be a *pliable function associated with* $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$ if the following hold:

(a) for each $a,b\in\Omega$, $[a,b]$ sends a to b and $[a,b]^{-1}=[b,a]$;
(b) for $a\neq b$, $\mathrm{supp}([a,b])=\{a,b\}\cup\{c \mid c \text{ is collinear with } a,b\}$.

Here $\mathrm{supp}(g)$ (for $g\in\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$) means the set of points of Ω moved by g, and a point c is *collinear* with $\{a,b\}$ if $\{a,b,c\}\in\mathcal{C}$. We usually assume also that $[a,a]=1$ for all $a\in\Omega$.

For such a function, and for each $a_0,a_1,\ldots,a_k\in\Omega$, define:

$$[a_0,a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_k]:=[a_0,a_1][a_1,a_2]\cdots[a_{k-1},a_k],$$

to be a *move sequence* and for each $\infty\in\Omega$, define:

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot]):=\{[\infty,a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_k] \mid k\in\mathbb{Z},a_1,\ldots,a_k\in\Omega\}\subseteq\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega);\ \text{and} \tag{5.1}$$

$$\pi_\infty([\cdot,\cdot]):=\{[\infty,a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_{k-1},\infty] \mid k\in\mathbb{Z},a_1,\ldots,a_{k-1}\in\Omega\}\subseteq\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega\backslash\{\infty\}) \tag{5.2}$$

to be the *Conway groupoid* and *hole-stabilizer*, respectively, associated with ∞. We have the following examples.

(a) A supersimple $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ design $\mathcal{D}=(\Omega,\mathcal{B})$ determines a $2-(n,3,2\lambda)$ design $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of collinear triples of $\mathcal{D}$. The elementary moves associated with $\mathcal{D}$ determine a pliable function $[\cdot,\cdot]:\Omega\times\Omega\longrightarrow\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ associated with $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$. Moreover $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})=\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])$ and $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})=\pi_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])$, for each $\infty\in\Omega$.
(b) *Any* finite group G determines a pliable function $[\cdot,\cdot]:G\times G\longrightarrow\mathrm{Sym}(G)$ associated with $(G,\mathcal{C})$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of all 3-subsets of G, by taking $[a,b]$ to be right multiplication by $a^{-1}b$. Thus $[a,b]$ is the unique element of the right regular action of G on G which maps a to b. Here $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$ is a $2-(n,3,n-2)$ design, where $n=|G|$, and $\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])\cong G$, $\pi_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])=1$. Observe that by (a) the Boolean $2-(2^m,4,2^{m-1}-1)$ designs of Example 2.3 determine pliable functions of this type where $G\cong(C_2)^m$.

(c) For an example which is not of either of these types consider the unique $2-(6,3,2)$ design $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$ whose lines are given by:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 012 & 023 & 034 & 045 & 051 \\ 124 & 235 & 341 & 452 & 513 \end{array}$$

Thus $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$ is the (extended) Paley two-graph with automorphism group $\mathrm{PSL}(2,5)$. For $a,b\in\Omega$, let $[a,b]:=\mathrm{Id}_\Omega$ if $a=b$ and otherwise set $[a,b]:=(a,b)(c,d)$ where $\{a,b,c\}$ and $\{a,b,d\}$ are the two lines containing $\{a,b\}$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Then $[\cdot,\cdot]$ becomes a pliable function associated with $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$, and it is easy to show that $\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])=\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})=\mathrm{PSL}(2,5)$.

(d) More exotic examples arise also. For example the Higman–Sims sporadic simple group HS has a 2-transitive action on a set Ω of degree 176, and Ω forms the point set of a $2-(176,3,162)$ design admitting HS as a group of automorphisms. Moreover the setwise stabiliser in HS of an unordered pair $\{a,b\}$ of distinct points has a unique central involution $z_{a,b}$. These involutions form a conjugacy class of HS of size $15400=\binom{176}{2}$ and, furthermore, the map $[\cdot,\cdot]:\Omega\times\Omega$ given by $[a,b]=z_{a,b}$ is a pliable function, yielding $\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])=HS$. We are grateful to Ben Fairbairn for informing us of this example.

Notice that $\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])$ formed a subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ in several of the above examples. Under this assumption, we can prove the following:

Theorem 5.1. *Let $[\cdot,\cdot]$ be a pliable function associated with a $2-(n,3,\mu)$ design $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$, where $\mu>4$, and suppose that $\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])$ is a group. If $n>\frac{3}{2}\mu$, then $\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])$ is primitive on Ω.*

Proof. Suppose that $n>\frac{3}{2}\mu$ and $\mu\geqslant 4$. Then $n>\mu+\frac{1}{2}\mu\geqslant\mu+2$, and we note that for distinct a,b, $|\operatorname{supp}([a,b])|=\mu+2$, by the definition of a pliable function. Suppose that G acts imprimitively on Ω with m blocks of size k, where $n=mk$ and $m>1,k>1$. First we observe that $m\geqslant 3$. This holds because, if $m=2$, then for points a,b in different blocks of imprimitivity, the elementary move $[a,b]$ must interchange the two blocks, and hence $[a,b]$ must move every point, contradicting the fact that $\operatorname{supp}([a,b])=\mu+2<n$. Now let a,b be distinct points in the same block of imprimitivity Δ, and let y be any point fixed by $[a,b]$ (such a point exists since $n>\mu+2$). By part (b) of the definition of a pliable function, it follows that $g:=[a,y]$ fixes b, so g must fix Δ setwise, and hence $y=a^g\in\Delta$. This shows that every point fixed by $[a,b]$ lies in Δ, or equivalently that $\Omega\setminus\Delta\subseteq\operatorname{supp}([a,b])$. Thus

$$\mu+2=|\operatorname{supp}([a,b])|\geqslant(m-1)k+2\quad\text{and hence}\quad\mu\geqslant(m-1)\cdot\frac{n}{m}.$$

Rearranging this yields

$$n\leqslant\frac{m}{(m-1)}\cdot\mu\leqslant\frac{3}{2}\cdot\mu \tag{5.3}$$

and this contradiction completes the proof. □

The bound given in Theorem 5.1 is achieved by at least one design. To see this we construct a pliable function for a $2-(9,3,6)$ design $(\Omega,\mathcal{C})$ with the property that $\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])$ is transitive but imprimitive. Let $\Omega:=(\mathbb{F}_3)^2$ and let $\mathcal{C}$ be the complement of an affine plane of order 3, that is,

$$\mathcal{C}:=\{\{a,b,c\}\mid a,b,c\in\Omega,a+b+c\neq 0\}.$$

For not necessarily distinct points $a, b \in \Omega$, set

$$[a,b] := \prod_{w+a+b\neq 0} (w, a+b-w).$$

Then $[a,b]$ is an involution with support of size eight and a unique fixed point $w = -a-b$. For each $\infty \in \Omega$, $\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot]) \cong (C_3 \times C_3) : C_2$ with the nine non-trivial involutions given by $\{[a,b] \mid a,b \in \Omega\}$ (notice that $[a,b] = [c,d]$ whenever $a+b = c+d$). Furthermore, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])$ preserves a system of imprimitivity with three blocks of size 3.

In fact this example is just one of an infinite family of $2-(3^k, 3, 3^k-3)$ designs constructed from complements of affine spaces with the property that they admit pliable functions with Conway groupoid an imprimitive group [17]. Just as the Boolean quadruple systems in Example 2.3 provided the "smallest" examples of designs satisfying the hypotheses of Theorems 4.7 and 4.9, one might hope that these $2-(3^k, 3, 3^k-3)$ designs could play a similar role in this more general context. For this reason, we ask the following:

Question 5.2. *Let $[\cdot,\cdot]$ be a pliable function associated with a $2-(n,3,\mu)$ design $(\Omega, \mathcal{C})$ and suppose that $\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])$ is a group. If $n > \mu+3$, is $\mathcal{L}_\infty([\cdot,\cdot])$ primitive?*

5.2. **Using 4-hypergraphs.** As discussed in Section 2, most of the interesting Conway groupoids known arise from $2-(n,4,\lambda)$ designs. We gave one alternative approach in Subsection 5.1 based on triple systems. Here we discuss briefly a few other possibilities involving 4-hypergraphs which are not 2-designs. The following infinite family of examples was presented in [16, Example 4.1].

Example 5.3. Let $n \geqslant 3$, let Ω be a set of size $2n$ consisting of the points $\{x_i, y_i \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\}$, and let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set

$$\mathcal{B} := \{\ \{x_i, y_i, x_j, y_j\}\ \mid\ 1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{D} := (\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ is a connected, pliable 4-hypergraph, and, for any $\infty \in \Omega$, the Conway groupoid $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ and hole stabilizer $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ are defined as in the first part of Section 2. It was noted in [16, Example 4.1] that $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(2) \wr \mathrm{Sym}(n-1)$ if n is odd, and that $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is an index 2 subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(2) \wr \mathrm{Sym}(n-1)$ if n is even. We give a short proof of this and also show that $G := \mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is a group, equal to $\mathrm{Sym}(2) \wr \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ if n is odd, and its the index 2 subgroup $(\mathrm{Sym}(2) \wr \mathrm{Sym}(n)) \cap \mathrm{Alt}(n)$ if n is even.

The elementary moves are: for distinct $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$,

$$[x_i, x_j] = [y_i, y_j] = (x_i, x_j)(y_i, y_j) \text{ and } [x_i, y_j] = [y_i, x_j] = (x_i, y_j)(x_j, y_i), \tag{5.4}$$

together with the fixed point free involution $[x_1, y_1] = \cdots = [x_n, y_n] = \prod_{i=1}^n (x_i, y_i)$. Since $\mathcal{D}$ is connected, we may assume that $\infty := x_1$. It is readily checked that for each triple of elements $a, b, c \in \Omega$ we have

$$[a,b]^{[b,c]} = [a^{[b,c]}, c].$$

Hence an argument in [18, Lemma 2.7] shows that G is a group. Moreover [18, Lemma 2.6] implies that $G_0 := \pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}) = \mathrm{stab}_G(\infty)$. (Note that, although both of the cited results in [18] are stated and proved for supersimple designs, in fact the argument carries through for connected, pliable 4-hypergraphs.)

Next we see that G leaves invariant the system of imprimitivity Δ given by

$$\Delta := \{\{x_i, y_i\} \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\}.$$

Hence G_0 fixes the block $\{x_1, y_1\}$ and we have

$$G \leqslant \mathrm{Sym}(2) \wr \mathrm{Sym}(n) \text{ and } G_0 \leqslant \mathrm{Sym}(2) \wr \mathrm{Sym}(n-1).$$

Since $G_0 = \mathrm{stab}_G(\infty)$, G_0 contains the elementary moves $[x_i, x_j], [x_i, y_j]$ given in (5.4), for each i, j such that $2 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n$, and moreover, G_0 contains the product of these two elements which is $(x_i, y_i)(x_j, y_j)$. Thus G_0 induces $\mathrm{Sym}(n-1)$ on $\{\{x_i, y_i\} \mid i = 2, \ldots, n\}$. Indeed $G_0 \cap \mathrm{Alt}(2n-2)$ induces $\mathrm{Sym}(n-1)$.

Now let $K \cong \mathrm{Sym}(2)^n$ denote the base group of the wreath product. Then, for distinct i, j, K contains $[x_i, x_j][x_i, y_j] = (x_i, y_i)(x_j, y_j)$, and it follows that $G \cap K$ contains all the even permutations in K. Together these points imply first that G_0 contains

$$(\mathrm{Sym}(2) \wr \mathrm{Sym}(n-1)) \cap \mathrm{Alt}(2n-2).$$

In particular, G_0 has index at most 2 in $\mathrm{Sym}(2) \wr \mathrm{Sym}(n-1)$. If n is even then every product of elementary moves is an even permutation, so that G_0 is as claimed. If n is odd, then G_0 also contains

$$g := [x_1, x_2, y_1, x_1] = [x_1, x_2][x_2, y_1][y_1, x_1] = (x_1, y_1)(x_2, y_2)[y_1, x_1]$$

which is an odd permutation since $[y_1, x_1] = \prod_{i=1}^{n}(x_i, y_i)$ is an odd permutation. Thus in this case G_0 is the full wreath product $\mathrm{Sym}(2) \wr \mathrm{Sym}(n-1))$. Very similar arguments confirm the claims about G (note that $|G| = |\Omega|\,|G_0|$).

The 4-hypergraphs in this family are not 2-designs since, for example, the pair $\{x_1, x_2\}$ lies in a unique line, while $\{x_1, y_1\}$ lies in $n-1$ lines. On the other hand, every pair of points is contained in at least one line. Hypergraphs with this property are said to be *collinearly complete*, (see [1]; their study goes back to work of D. G. Higman and J. E. McLaughlin in [21]).

Question 5.4. *Are there other interesting familes of Conway groupoids arising from collinearly complete* 4*-hypergraphs which are not* 2*-designs?*

The family of connected pliable 4-hypergraphs extends beyond those which are collinearly complete. It includes, for example, generalised quadrangles with 4 points on each line. There are only finitely many such geometries, and it is shown in [17] that for each of them the Conway groupoid is the full alternating group.

Question 5.5. *Are there interesting Conway groupoids arising from connected pliable* 4*-hypergraphs which are not collinearly complete?*

5.3. M_{24}**.** In the previous two subsections we have started with different geometries, and sought to "play" analogues of Conway's original "game" in order to obtain groups and / or groupoids.

What about if one works backwards, that is to say, one starts with a group and seeks to define a game on an appropriate geometry that generates it? As we described at the start of this paper, this was Conway's original approach: he came to define his game after observing certain structural coincidences between the groups $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$ and M_{12}.

In fact this structural coincidence can precisely be described as a '3-local equivalence' (in the sense that $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$ and M_{12} have isomorphic 3-fusion systems) and one immediately wonders whether there are other (pairs of) p-locally equivalent groups whose structure can be exploited in some similar fashion to give a "natural" generation game.

For example, might the group M_{24} be amenable to such an analysis, perhaps via some analogue of the dualized game (described in §1.2) played on an appropriate geometry? Might there exist a Conway groupoid M_{25} – or perhaps, as Conway himself mentioned after a lecture given by the third author – might there be an M_{26}? In this direction, the 3-local equivalence between M_{24} and $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3) : 2$ is particularly suggestive (note that the latter can be realised as a group of permutations on 26 letters). In any case, a generation game for M_{24} would be immensely interesting and would naturally lead one to wonder about the other sporadic simple groups.

Question 5.6. *Can the group M_{24} be generated in a natural way via a generation game on some finite geometry?*

References

[1] Seyed Hassan Alavi, John Bamberg, and Cheryl E. Praeger, *Triple factorisations of the general linear group and their associated geometries*, Linear Algebra Appl. **469** (2015), 169–203.

[2] Laszlo Babai, *On the order of uniprimitive permutation groups*, Ann. Math. (2) **113** (1981), 553–568.

[3] L. A. Bassalygo and V. A. Zinov′ev, *A remark on uniformly packed codes*, Problemy Peredači Informacii **13** (1977), no. 3, 22–25. MR 0497283

[4] Arrigo Bonisoli and Pasquale Quattrocchi, *Each invertible sharply d-transitive finite permutation set with $d \geqslant 4$ is a group*, J. Algebr. Comb. **12** (2000), no. 3, 241–250.

[5] J. Borges, J. Rifà, and V. A. Zinoviev, *On non-antipodal binary completely regular codes*, Discrete Math. **308** (2008), no. 16, 3508–3525.

[6] J. Borges, J. Rifà, and V. A. Zinoviev, *On q-ary linear completely regular codes with $\rho = 2$ and antipodal dual*, Adv. Math. Commun. **4** (2010), no. 4, 567–578.

[7] J. Borges, J. Rif, and V.A. Zinoviev, *Families of completely transitive codes and distance transitive graphs*, Discrete Mathematics **324** (2014), 68 – 71.

[8] Joaquim Borges, Josep Rif, and Victor A. Zinoviev, *Families of nested completely regular codes and distance-regular graphs*, Advances in Mathematics of Communications **9** (2015), no. 2, 233–246.

[9] A. E. Brouwer, A. M. Cohen, and A. Neumaier, *Distance-regular graphs*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], vol. 18, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[10] Peter J. Cameron, *Geometric sets of permutations*, Geom. Dedicata **25** (1988), no. 1-3, 339–351, Geometries and groups (Noordwijkerhout, 1986).

[11] J. H. Conway, M_{13}, Surveys in combinatorics, 1997 (London), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 241, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 1–11.

[12] J. H. Conway, N. D. Elkies, and J. L. Martin, *The Mathieu group M_{12} and its pseudogroup extension M_{13}*, Experiment. Math. 15 **2** (2006), 223–236.

[13] P. Delsarte, *An algebraic approach to the association schemes of coding theory*, Philips Res. Rep. Suppl. (1973), no. 10, vi+97.

[14] J. D. Dixon and B. Mortimer, *Permutation groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 163, Springer-Verlag, 1996.

[15] Bernd Fischer, *Finite groups generated by 3-transpositions. I*, Invent. Math. **13** (1971), 232–246.

[16] N. Gill, N. I. Gillespie, A. Nixon, and J. Semeraro, *Generating groups with hypergraphs*, 2015, To appear in *Quarterly J. Math.*

[17] N. Gill, N. I. Gillespie, C. E. Praeger, and J. Semeraro, *Conway groupoids from triple systems and other structures*, 2016, in preparation.

[18] ———, *Conway groupoids, regular two-graphs and supersimple designs*, 2015, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.06680`.

[19] N. Gill, N. I. Gillespie, and J. Semeraro, *Conway groupoids and completely transitive codes*, 2015, To appear in *Combinatorica*.

[20] Michael Giudici and Cheryl E. Praeger, *Completely transitive codes in hamming graphs*, European Journal of Combinatorics **20** (1999), no. 7, 647 – 662.

[21] D. G. Higman and J. E. McLaughlin, *Geometric ABA-groups*, Illinois J. Math. **5** (1961), 382–397.
[22] Martin W. Liebeck and Jan Saxl, *Minimal degrees of primitive permutation groups, with an application to monodromy groups of covers of Riemann surfaces*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **63** (1991), no. 2, 266–314.
[23] W. A. Manning, *The primitive groups of class* $2p$ *which contain a substitution of order* p *and degree* $2p$, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 4 **3** (1903), 351–357.
[24] ———, *On the primitive groups of classes six and eight*, Amer. J. Math. **3** (1910), 235–256.
[25] William J. Martin and Bruce E. Sagan, *A new notion of transitivity for groups and sets of permutations*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser. **73** (2006), no. 1, 1–13.
[26] Yasuhiro Nakashima, *The transitivity of Conway's* M_{13}, Discrete Math. **308** (2008), no. 11, 2273–2276.
[27] A. Neumaier, *Completely regular codes*, Discrete Math. **106/107** (1992), 353–360, A collection of contributions in honour of Jack van Lint.
[28] J. Rifà and V. A. Zinoviev, *On a class of binary linear completely transitive codes with arbitrary covering radius*, Discrete Math. **309** (2009), no. 16, 5011–5016.
[29] J. Rifà and V. A. Zinoviev, *New completely regular* q*-ary codes based on Kronecker products*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **56** (2010), no. 1, 266–272.
[30] Josep Rifà and Victor A. Zinoviev, *On lifting perfect codes*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **57** (2011), no. 9, 5918–5925.
[31] J. J. Seidel, *On two-graphs and Shult's characterization of symplectic and orthogonal geometries over GF (2)*, T.H.-Report 73-WSK-02. Eindhoven, Netherlands: Technological University, Dept. of Mathematics. 25 p. (1973).
[32] E. Shult, *Characterizations of certain classes of graphs*, J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B **13** (1972), 142–167.
[33] Patrick Sole, *Completely regular codes and completely transitive codes*, Discrete Mathematics **81** (1990), no. 2, 193 – 201.
[34] Henricus Carolus Adrianus van Tilborg, *Uniformly packed codes*, Technische Hogeschool Eindhoven, Eindhoven, 1976, With a Dutch summary, Doctoral dissertation, University of Technology Eindhoven. MR 0414226

Department of Mathematics, University of South Wales, Treforest, CF37 1DL, U.K.
E-mail address: nick.gill@southwales.ac.uk

Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research, Department of Mathematics, University of Bristol, U.K.
E-mail address: neil.gillespie@bristol.ac.uk

Centre for the Mathematics of Symmetry and Computation, University of Western Australia, Australia, also affiliated with King Abdulaziz University Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
E-mail address: cheryl.praeger@uwa.edu.au

Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research, Department of Mathematics, University of Bristol, U.K.
E-mail address: js13525@bristol.ac.uk